



**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**PROJECT NUMBER: CUP 02-260**

**1. DESCRIPTION:**

The construction of a retail center consisting of an automobile/vehicle accessory sales pavilion (1,885 sq.ft.), automobile service workshop (6,190 sq.ft.) located on the northwestern portion of the lot, a two-story office/retail building (11,550 sq.ft.) located on the southwestern portion of the lot, and a restaurant (6,700 sq.ft.) located on the southeastern portion of the lot. 179 parking spaces will be provided and the main entrance will be on Parker Road.

**2. LOCATION:**

Southeast corner of Parker Road, between the I-5 Freeway and The Old Road, Castaic

**3. PROPONENT:**

Bob and Gayle Bakshi Living Trust  
24055 Creekside Road  
Valencia, CA 91355

**4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:**

**BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT WITH MODIFICATION AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS FORM INCLUDED AS PART OF THE INITIAL STUDY**

**5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**

**THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS:  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012**

**PREPARED BY:** Impact Analysis Section, Department of Regional Planning

**DATE:** March 3, 2004

**\*\*\*\*\* INITIAL STUDY \*\*\*\*\*****COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: May 1, 2003 Staff Member: Hsiaoching Chen  
Thomas Guide: 4369 H-7 USGS Quad: Newhall  
Location: Southeast corner of Parker Road, between the I-5 Freeway and The Old Road, Castaic, California  
91384

Description of Project: An application for a Conditional Use Permit to authorize the construction of a retail Center consisting of an automobile/vehicle accessory sales pavilion (1,885 SF) and automobile service workshop (6,190 SF) located on the North Western portion of the lot, a two-story office/retail building (11,550 SF) located on the South Western portion of the lot, and a restaurant (6,700 SF) located on the South Eastern portion of the lot. 179 parking spaces are proposed. The main entrance will be on Parker Road.

Gross Acres: 3.5 Acres

Environmental Setting: The proposed project site is located within the unincorporated community of Castaic. The subject property previously contained cottonwood riparian vegetation and gentle slopes to the East. The subject property is located immediately adjacent to the North Eastern boundary of The Old Rd., Southern boundary of Parker Rd. and Western boundary of Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway. Surrounding land uses within 500 feet of the site consist of vacant lots and a hotel to the North; a vacant lot and multi-family residential units to the South; Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway, a mobile home park, service station and vacant lots to the East; and a L.A. County Road Maintenance Vehicle Yard and mobile home park to the West. The project site is also less than ½ mile West of a channelized and unnamed drainage course that runs parallel to Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway, and flows into Castaic Creek.

Zoning: CPD (Commercial Planned Development)

General Plan: Major Commercial

Community/Area wide Plan: Commercial [Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan]

## Major projects in area:

<u>PROJECT NUMBER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION &amp; STATUS</u>
<i>CUP 90-042</i>	<i>Motel on 2.07 AC in C3 (Approved 10/17/90)</i>
<i>CUP 00-253</i>	<i>Hotel: 121 Suites (Pool, Dining for Breakfast)(Pending)</i>
<i>CUP 97-172</i>	<i>Commercial Service/Retail Business (Pending)</i>
<i>CUP 02-152</i>	<i>Parking Lot for Motel Customers (Pending)</i>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

## REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region <input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <u>Trustee Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> None   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game <input type="checkbox"/> State Parks <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Special Reviewing Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy <input type="checkbox"/> National Parks <input type="checkbox"/> National Forest <input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Castaic Area Town Council</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Regional Significance</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>  <u>County Reviewing Agencies</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: <i>Drainage and Grading; Geotechnical and Materials Engineering; Watershed Management; Watershed Management (NPDES Section); Traffic and Lighting; Flood Maintenance Division</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--

<b>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</b>		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg			Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Seismic Hazard Zone – liquefaction</i>
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Flood Hazard Zone</i>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>NPDES permit required</i>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Major riparian vegetation</i>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Cumulative traffic impacts</i>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Biota, traffic</i>

## DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS\* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: Conservation/Maintenance
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

**If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.**

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

**Environmental Finding:**

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☒ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT\*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik Date: 8 MARCH 2004

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

\*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

## HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <i>The project site is within the boundary of the San Gabriel Fault. (L.A. County General Plan Safety Element – Fault Rupture Hazards and Seismic Activity Map)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <i>The project site is within a liquefiable area. (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map, Newhall Quadrangle)</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? <i>ISQ indicates that 15,000 – 20,000 cubic yards of grading will occur.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>The project site is immediately adjacent to a hillside boundary. (L.A. County General Plan Safety Element – Landslide Inventory Map)</i>

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

*Geotechnical Report by Southwest Geotechnical, Inc. dated 10/24/02 on file. Detailed liquefaction analysis required. DPW letter of 8/25/03 stated project will not significant impacts from geology/soil standpoint.*

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation

☐ Less than significant/No Impact

## HAZARDS - 2. Flood

## SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- |    |                          |                                     |                                     |  |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?<br><i>The project site is less than ½ mile West of an unnamed and channelized drainage course that runs parallel to Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway and flows into Castaic Creek. (USGS Newhall, California Quad Sheet)</i> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?<br><i>An unnamed drainage course is within the project site.</i>  |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?  |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?   |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?<br><i>ISQ indicates that the existing inflow will be altered via a new storm drain.</i>   |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?<br><i>The project site is within the Castaic Dam or Debris Basin, and immediately West of 100 - year flood areas. (L.A. County General Plan Safety Element – Flood and Inundation Hazards Map)</i>  |

## STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A      ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
- ☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW on 1/6/04
- ☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**      ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
- ☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design

*Comply with all conditions of approval of the drainage concept approved on 1/6/2004.*

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- ☐ Potentially significant      ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 3. Fire

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? <i>The project site is within Fire Zone 4. (L.A. County General Plan Safety Element – Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards Map)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8  
☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

### ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact



## HAZARDS - 4. Noise

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? <i>The project site is immediately adjacent to the Western boundary of Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway. (500' Radius Land Use Map)</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Control Title 12, Chapter 8    ☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size    ☒ Project Design    ☒ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? <i>ISQ indicates that domestic water service exists at the project site.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? <i>ISQ indicates that public sewer service exists at the project site.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? <i>N/A</i>
c.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>The project is subject to NPDES requirements.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>The project is subject to NPDES requirements.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Industrial Waste Permit
 ☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5  
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269

- ☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**  
☐ Lot Size
 ☐ Project Design
 ☐ Compatible Use
 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- ☐ Potentially significant
 ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? <i>The project site is adjacent to Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway. (500' Land Use Radius Map)</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ Project Design      ☐ Air Quality Report

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 3. Biota

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? <i>Flood control improvements will eliminate riparian vegetation.</i> <i>ISQ indicates that 15,000 – 20,000 cubic yards of grading will occur.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? <i>The project site is less than ½ mile West of an unnamed and channelized drainage course that runs parallel to Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway and flows into Castaic Creek (USGS Newhall, California Quad Sheet); an unnamed drainage course is within the project site.</i>
d.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)? <i>The project site contains cottonwood willow riparian woodland. Applicant has removed portion of the vegetation within the woodland.</i>
e.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? <i>The project site contains cottonwood trees. Applicant has removed portion of the vegetation within the woodland.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? <i>Arroyo toad known from Castaic Creek, East of Highway 5.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size
 ☐ Project Design
 ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review
 ☐ Oak Tree Permit

*Fish and Game letter of 3/10/03 on file. A 5:1 habitat replacement will be required.*

*Army Corps of Engineers claimed no jurisdiction (letter of 1/7/03).*

*See attached mitigation measures for details.*

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?</p> <p><i>The project site is less than 1/2 mile West of an unnamed and channelized drainage course that runs parallel to Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway and flows into Castaic Creek. (USGS Newhall, California Quad Sheet)</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?</p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?</p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?</p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design

---

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?</p> <p><i>The project site is immediately adjacent to the Western boundary of Interstate 5 Golden State Freeway – Second Priority Scenic Highway. (Scenic Highway System Map Index)</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?</p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?</p> <p><i>The proposed project is adjacent to the Eastern boundary of an existing road maintenance and vehicle yard for L.A. County. (500' Radius Map)</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?</p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?</p>

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

### ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size
 ☐ Project Design
 ☐ Visual Report
 ☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact



## SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design    ☒ Traffic Report

☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

*DPW letter of 2/24/04 on file. See attached mitigation measures for details..*

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☒ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

### SERVICES - 3. Education

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication    ☐ Government Code Section 65995    ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
- ISQ indicates that the nearest fire station is ~1/2 mile away.*
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?
- 
- 
- 
- 

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

---

---

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

### ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? <i>ISQ indicates that motor oil/cleaning solvent will be stored on site.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? <i>Multi-family residential units are located within 500' South of the project site. (500' Land Use Map)</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

### ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact



## OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

---



---



---



---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> <p><i>Biota</i></p> <hr/>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.</p> <p><i>Traffic</i></p> <hr/>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <hr/>

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant
 ☒ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☐ Less than significant/No impact



**PROJECT CHANGES/CONDITIONS  
DUE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION**

**PROJECT No. CUP 02-260**

The Department of Regional Planning (DRP) staff has determined that the following conditions or changes in the project are necessary in order to assure that there will be no substantial evidence that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The applicant shall deposit the sum of \$3,000 with the DRP within 30 days of permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports by a Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP).

**Geotechnical**

To mitigate project's potential geotechnical impacts, the applicant shall submit a detailed liquefaction analysis to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any grading permits.

**Flood**

To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

**Water Quality**

The applicant shall submit a Stormwater Quality Plan to the Department of Public Works for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits and comply with NPDES requirement of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Department of Public Works.

**Biota**

To mitigate project's impact on 0.29 acres of cottonwood riparian habitat, the applicant shall submit a habitat enhancement plan for a total of 1.45 acres of cotton woodwillow riparian woodlands for review and approval by the California Department of Fish and Game prior to issuance of any grading permits. The location for the habitat enhancement shall be located within the Castaic Creek Watershed or Santa Clara River Watershed within the Los Angeles County. A copy of the enhancement plan and all subsequent reports shall be submitted to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning.

## **Traffic**

To mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on the following County intersections, the applicant shall contribute its fair share of fee to the Castaic Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee (B&T) District prior to issuance of any building permit.

- § The Old Road at Lake Hughes Road/Sloan Canyon Road
- § Golden State (I-5) Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road
- § I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp at Parker Road

To mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on County intersections and roadways, the applicant shall be responsible for the following improvements:

- § The northern project driveway on the Old Road shall be restricted to right-turn in and out only. The southern project driveway on the Old Road shall be granted full access with adequate left-turn pocket on the Old Road.
- § Restrict the driveway on Parker Road to right-turn in and out only.
- § The eight parking spaces adjacent to the driveway on Parker Road are for display vehicles or employee parking only. Proper signage shall be installed to indicate such.
- § Restrict the off-loading to be on-site only and not within any adjacent public right of way.
- § Detailed striping and signing plans along the project frontage for Parker Road and the Old Road shall be prepared and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall contribute its proportionate shares of the cost for traffic signals for the following intersections in order to mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on County intersections and roadways: the Old Road at Lake Hughes Road and Sloan Canyon Road, I-5 Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road, and I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp at Parker Road. The estimated cost of the signal will be adjusted each year to reflect the Consumer Price index used by the Department of Regional Planning in March of each year.

## **Mitigation Compliance**

As a means of ensuring compliance of above mitigation measures, the applicant and subsequent owner(s) are responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review, and for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented and completed.

As the applicant, I agree to incorporate these changes/conditions into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Hearing Officer and/or Regional Planning Commission will be on the project as changed/conditioned.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Applicant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

No response with 10 days. Environmental Determination requires that these changes/conditions be included in the project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Staff

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**  
**PROJECT No. CUP 02-260**

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
<b>Geotechnical</b>				
To mitigate project's potential geotechnical impacts, the applicant shall submit a detailed liquefaction analysis to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any grading permits.	Submittal and approval of detailed liquefaction analysis	prior to issuance of any grading permits	Applicant	Public Works
<b>Flood</b>				
To mitigate project's potential impact on drainage, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the drainage concept to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of any grading permits.	Compliance of drainage concept approved to the satisfaction of Public Works	prior to issuance of grading permits	Applicant	Public Works
<b>Water Quality</b>				
The applicant shall submit a Stormwater Quality Plan to the Department of Public Works for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits and comply with NPDES requirement of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Department of Public Works.	Submittal and approval of Stormwater Quality Plan	Prior to issuance of grading permits	Applicant	Public Works Regional Water Quality Control Board
<b>Biota</b>				
The applicant shall mitigate for the permanent loss of 0.29 acres of California Department of Fish and Game jurisdictional area by the enhancement or restoration of 0.58 acres of cottonwood/willow riparian habitat in a CDFG approved site on Castaic Creek or a	Habitat enhancement/restoration will consist of plantings of willow ( <i>Salix</i> sp.) and cottonwood ( <i>Populus fremontii</i> ) trees, planting or seeding of other locally indigenous riparian plant species as appropriate, and removal of invasive plant	Prior to issuance of grading permit  A five year maintenance and monitoring program shall be implemented, the performance standards of which shall include a guarantee of self sustainability of the	Applicant	Regional Planning California Department of Fish and Game

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**  
PROJECT No. CUP 02-260

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
<p>nearby tributary thereof in compliance with CDFG requirements and Los Angeles County land use regulations.</p>	<p>species. A list of plant species to be used for the restoration shall be submitted to the Department of Regional Planning for review and approval.</p> <p>Prior to installation of the enhancement/restoration, the permittee shall post a performance security, satisfactory to the CDFG, in an amount and form sufficient to cover the cost of replacement and enhancement/restoration in a more suitable location in the event the performance standards have not been met.</p>	<p>enhancement/restoration after five years.</p>		
<p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p>To mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on the following County intersections, the applicant shall contribute its fair share of fee to the Castaic Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee (B&amp;T) District prior to issuance of any building permit.</p> <p>§ The Old Road at Lake Hughes Road/Sloan Canyon Road</p> <p>§ Golden State (I-5) Freeway</p> <p>§ Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road</p> <p>§ I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp at Parker</p>	<p>Payment of B&amp;T fee</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any building permit</p>	<p>Applicant</p>	<p>Public Works</p>

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**  
PROJECT No. CUP 02-260

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
<p>Road</p> <p>To mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on County intersections and roadways, the applicant shall be responsible for the following improvements:</p> <p>§ The northern project driveway on the Old Road shall be restricted to right-turn in and out only. The southern project driveway on the Old Road shall be granted full access with adequate left-turn pocket on the Old Road.</p> <p>§ Restrict the driveway on Parker Road to right-turn in and out only.</p> <p>§ The eight parking spaces adjacent to the driveway on Parker Road are for display vehicles or employee parking only. Proper signage shall be installed to indicate such.</p> <p>§ Restrict the off-loading to be on-site only and not within any adjacent public right of way.</p> <p>§ Detailed striping</p>	Completion of specified improvements	Prior to issuance of any building permit	Applicant	Public Works



MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM  
PROJECT No. CUP 02-260

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and signing plans along the project frontage for Parker Road and the Old Road shall be prepared and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.				
Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall contribute its proportionate shares of the cost for traffic signals for the following intersections in order to mitigate project's potential cumulative impacts on County intersections and roadways: the Old Road at Lake Hughes Road and Sloan Canyon Road, I-5 Freeway Southbound On-Ramp at Parker Road, and I-5 Northbound Off-Ramp at Parker Road. The estimated cost of the signal will be adjusted each year to reflect the Consumer Price index used by the Department of Regional Planning in March of each year.	Payment of improvement cost	Prior to issuance of any building permit	Applicant	Public Works
<b>Mitigation Compliance</b> As a means of ensuring compliance of all above mitigation measures, the applicant is responsible for submitting annual mitigation compliance report to the DRP for review and for replenishing	Submittal of annual Mitigation Measure Compliance report and replenishment of Mitigation Monitoring account	Annual under such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented.	Applicant	Regional Planning

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM  
PROJECT No. CUP 02-260

Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until such time as all mitigation measures have been implemented.				